

Message

From: Schlosser, Paul [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=121CF759D94E4F08AFDE0CEB646E711B-SCHLOSSER, PAUL]
Sent: 7/8/2013 3:02:46 PM
To: Sasso, Alan [Sasso.Alan@epa.gov]; Fox, John [Fox.John@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Formaldehyde assessment for review by the IRIS Disciplinary Workgroups

One of the things Vince said he wants to avoid is nit-picking over grammar, spelling and the like. Review to see if the science is correct, if it's clear, etc. So I imagine that's what he meant as 'hypothetical peer reviewers'. But I'd still say it's from the perspective of the PKWG/SWG for what sorts of things to review.

-Paul

From: Sasso, Alan
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 10:31 AM
To: Schlosser, Paul; Fox, John
Subject: RE: Formaldehyde assessment for review by the IRIS Disciplinary Workgroups

Yeah, I'm a little confused regarding the new workflow, although formaldehyde is "special".

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

-Alan

From: Schlosser, Paul
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 10:24 AM
To: Fox, John
Cc: Sasso, Alan
Subject: RE: Formaldehyde assessment for review by the IRIS Disciplinary Workgroups

John,
Cc: Alan

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Took a while for my backlog of email to come into my machine - working from home today - going to start wading through now.

-Paul

From: Fox, John
Sent: Wednesday, July 03, 2013 8:30 AM

To: Schlosser, Paul

Subject: FYI: Formaldehyde assessment for review by the IRIS Disciplinary Workgroups

Please contact Alan Sasso, he told me that he had been assigned to review BBDR section

Also, we were told that two reviewers are wanted for each major section

Paul White may be willing to review the BBDR

There is an Epi workgroup and they are handling epi including dose-response based on human data

RE: "Sources of Uncertainty Associated with Combined Unit Risk" that I think should have a different sub-section number and we'd want to look at."

Thanks for noticing that and alerting the rest of us.

From: Schlosser, Paul

Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2013 1:55 PM

To: Burgoon, Lyle; McLanahan, Eva; Whalan, John; Stanek, John

Cc: Fox, John; Hogan, Karen

Subject: RE: Formaldehyde assessment for review by the IRIS Disciplinary Workgroups

Lyle, all (adding John Fox and Karen Hogan),

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

-Paul

From: Burgoon, Lyle

Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2013 1:08 PM

To: Schlosser, Paul; McLanahan, Eva; Whalan, John; Stanek, John

Subject: FW: Formaldehyde assessment for review by the IRIS Disciplinary Workgroups

PKWG and Inhalation/Resp WG Co-Chairs:

I've reviewed the assessment and the excel sheet.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

That's what I got from my quick glance. I suggest the co-chairs may want to meet and hash a few things out...but it's only a suggestion.

Cheers,

Lyle

Lyle D. Burgoon, Ph.D
Chief, Hazardous Pollutant Assessment Group (Acting)
National Center for Environmental Assessment
US Environmental Protection Agency
Phone: 919.541.7808
Fax: 919.685.3473
Cell: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Notice (If This Communication Regards a Contract): Nothing in this message shall be construed as a change to the price, schedule, or terms and conditions of the contract. If the receiver does construe it otherwise, please notify me immediately so that proper contract action can be initiated.

From: Cogliano, Vincent

Sent: Monday, July 01, 2013 6:38 PM

To: Bale, Ambuja; Ball, James; Christensen, Krista; Fox, John; Gehlhaus, Martin; Gibbons, Catherine; Guyton, Kate; Hogan, Karen; Hotchkiss, Andrew; Keshava, Nagalakshmi; Kraft, Andrew; Makris, Susan; Newhouse, Kathleen; Persad, Amanda; Schlosser, Paul; Stanek, John; Subramaniam, Ravi; Whalan, John

Cc: Glenn, Barbara; Kraft, Andrew; Burgoon, Lyle; Bussard, David; Chiu, Weihsueh; Cogliano, Vincent; DeSantis, Joe; Gatchett, Annette; Hammerstrom, Karen; Hawkins, Belinda; Perovich, Gina; Rieth, Susan; Ris, Charles; Ross, Mary; Sams, Reeder; Sonawane, Bob; Strong, Jamie; Troyer, Michael; Vandenberg, John; Walsh, Debra

Subject: Formaldehyde assessment for review by the IRIS Disciplinary Workgroups

Hello Disciplinary Workgroup Co-Chairs – Attached are the Tox Review for Formaldehyde, a memo describing approaches to the quantitative cancer assessment, and a “map” that identifies sections that pertain to each Disciplinary Workgroup. The Supplemental Information document will follow Tuesday.

We will discuss the process for reviewing this assessment at Tuesday morning's IRIS Management Council. Then the management liaisons can discuss the review process with their respective Co-Chairs. The Co-Chairs should select primary and secondary reviewers for the sections that are pertinent to their discipline, forward the assessment to their respective Workgroups, and determine how and when their Workgroup will meet to discuss the comments that you will send to the Assessment Managers (Barbara Glenn and Andrew Kraft).

Your review should cover:

1. Are the sections you reviewed clear, convincing, and objective?
2. Are the conclusions supported by the evidence presented?
3. Are the science issues addressed effectively, with alternative perspectives discussed where appropriate?
4. Are the issues raised by the NRC review of April 2011 addressed effectively?

You need not review the original literature. Begin with the evidence tables and see whether the synthesis follows logically and clearly. If not, that is a comment to take up within the Disciplinary Workgroup.

I will also welcome your feedback about how this process worked and how we might improve it in the future.

Thank you for your assistance in simulating the SAB and public reviews of this important assessment,
Vince

From: Glenn, Barbara
Sent: Monday, July 01, 2013 5:40 PM
To: Cogliano, Vincent
Cc: Bussard, David; Perovich, Gina; Sonawane, Bob; Kraft, Andrew
Subject:

The draft toxicological review for formaldehyde is attached. A file containing supplemental information will be sent later today (we have encountered problems inserting portions, complicated by the problems with Outlook that occurred today). We (the formaldehyde team) are looking forward to participating in the review process and anticipate a stronger product as a result.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

The draft contains several comment bubbles throughout indicating items that the team/authors are aware of and revisions that they plan on making. Revisions to various parts of the document are ongoing. In particular, the documentation of dose-response analyses for cancer is in flux.

Instead of extensive track-changes in the files, providing editorial comments in comment bubbles will be more helpful for revisions because the document is not static at this point.

Regards, Barbara and Andrew